

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 19-20, 21 and 28-30 have been amended. Claims 12, 15-18 and 23-27 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-11, 13-14, 19-22 and 28-30 are presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed July 25, 2005.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 19-22, 28-30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”) in view of Banker, U.S. Patent No. 6,005,938 (“Banker”).

Rajasekharan discloses “a method and apparatus for *secure streaming of digital audio/visual content*. Authorization and integrity checks are performed by a client or playback device on a set of data associated with digital content to be played. *The set of data includes authorization and integrity information for content to be received from the source*. Streamed content is received from the source by the playback device. The streamed content is intermittently checked for authorization and integrity. If the check is passed, playback continues, otherwise playback is halted.” (Abstract; emphasis provided).

Banker discloses “[a] technique for preventing replay attacks on digital information distributed by network service provides.” (Abstract). Banker further discloses that “communication [is provided] between set-top box and head-end or between set-top boxes and the set-top boxes. *Both EMMs and ECMs are sent as packets of digital data*, while service interface may be sent either in digital or analog form.” (col.

6, lines 48-54; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “transmitting the one or more fingerprint blocks to the client via a first connection; and on-demand transmitting the data stream to the client via a second connection, wherein the on-demand transmitting of the data stream includes one of simultaneous transmission and delayed transmission.”

(emphasis provided). Neither Rajasekharan nor Banker, individually or when combined, teach or reasonably suggest transmitting the data stream on-demand, as recited by claim

1. Neither reference teaches or reasonably suggests simultaneous or delayed transmission of the data stream to the client via second connection, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Independent claims 4, 9, 19 and 28 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 9, 19 and 28 and their dependent claims.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 14, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980